DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 440 SO 012 366

AUTHOR Femminella, Francis X.
TITLE Ethnic Dimensions of Citizenship.
PUB DATE 18 May 76
NOTE 34p.: For related documents, see SO 012 364-365: Expanded version of a paper read at the White House Conference on Ethnicity and Education (May 18, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship: Conceptual Schemes: *Cultural Background: Cultural Pluralism: Educational Responsibility: Elementary Secondary Education: *Ethnic Groups: *Ethnicity: Immigrants: Public Schools: *School Role: Self Concept: Social Integration

ABSTRACT

The relationship between ethnic heritage and citizenship is explored in this paper. The author develops his analysis in four chapters. Chapter I examines levels of identity through which all individuals progress as they mature. These include identification with oneself, one's family, the extended family and ethnic group, the nation, and the world community. Education is seen to help in developing individuals' conscious awareness of their own identifications. Chapter II discusses concepts of ego-identity (self-image in relation to others) and ideology (value-influencing phenomena which connect individuals to their society). Interpretations of these concepts by Erik Erikson, K. Mannheim, and N. A. Murray are outlined and are used to generate a new concept of ethnic ideological themes. Ethnic ideological themes are the value orientations which are held in common by members of an ethnic group. Chapter III explores the concept of ethnic identity in relation to effects of immigration and interaction with resident native groups. The author notes the transformation of the melting pot theory to the theory of cultural pluralism (see SO 012 364), the phenomenon of alienation of new immigrant groups from native residents, and differing effects of immigrant status on first, second, third, and fourth generation immigrants. Chapter IV considers the concept of citizenship and its relation to education. Since the educational system helps shape an individual's identity, all Americans have the right to expect it to promote ethnic heritage awareness as well as awareness of citizenship responsibilities. (AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAR 3 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francis Femminella

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED183440

ETHNIC DIMENSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

Francis X. Femminella, Ph.d.
State University of New York
at Albany

Expanded Version of a paper read
at the White House Conference
on
Ethnicity and Education
May 18, 1976

SP 012 366

ETHNIC DIMENSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

The persistence of ethnicity in the United States has been well documented.[1] It has never, however, really been explained why ethnicity persists. And it has not been explained why ethnicity has persisted in spite of the schools' efforts to eliminate it. A committment to American heritage has been interpreted to mean the elimination of ethnic heritage. But it doesn't have to be that way and it has not been. Ethnic heritage and citizenship are connected in various and very important ways.

The purpose of this study is to explore these notions and to propose a paradigm for showing interconnections and interrelationships between them. In the first and second parts of this paper the first and second systems of interconnections will be outlined and described. The concepts of ego-identity (E. H. Erikson),[2] ideology (K. Mannheim),[3] thema (N. A. Murray)[4] will be used to generate a new notion - the concept of "ethnic ideological themes."[5] The empirical existence of these ethnic ideological themes will be shown and their important implications for education in ethnic heritage and in citizenship will be developed.

The joining together of the concepts of ego identity and ethnic heritage leads to the examination of the concept of ethnic identity. This concept will be examined in Part III along with the question of ethnic and racial ideologies. In particular we will be concerned with assimilation theories and melting pot theories as illustrations of what is meant by ideological thinking. In an attempt to encapsulate and move beyond these theories the "impact-integration" theory[6] will be proposed.

In Part IV the concept of citizenship and its relation to education will be examined. Global interdependence, that is, the intrusion of international relations on the everyday life of everyone on earth will be focused upon briefly.

I.

The process of coming to know oneself is a process and classical aim of education. Concomitantly, it is a process of multi-level identifications that goes on in and through time. Identification is a process by which a person feels affectively united to, endeavors to pattern himself after or ascribes to himself the qualities, characteristics, values or interests of another person or group.

One level of identification to be considered is the level of self wherein one identifies with oneself, and one acquires a sense of selfsameness. The schools are meant to aid this process. They aim at making people free, helping their students "to become all they are capable of becoming", and this implies a personal growth process that culminates in self reliance and independence. The process incorporates socialization into a society and the acquiring and transmitting of culture and socialization into a society and the acquiring and transmitting of culture and social heritage.

A second level of identification is the level of immediate social environment, that is identification with one's family. Usually persons have a sense of family and indeed a sense of pride in family. We mention our family names, and they are symbols to which we attach ourselves and in which we have pride. This is not the kind of pride that requires us to "put down" or to depri-cate other families. It is, however, the basis by which we learn how to deal with other persons. Pride in family is not normally found to be ethnocentric. Ethnocentrism refers to placing heightened value on one's own group and devaluing other groups. Essential to the meaning of ethnocentrism is the devaluing of other groups; and such devaluation is not a part of family pride. On the contrary,

familial identification on one person's part seems to permit of, and even engenders respect for familial identification on the part of others.

A third level of identification that persons enter into is that of the extended family and the ethnic group. Identification reaches through past generations to a mythical origin, and one may or not have awareness of the mythologic base for this identification.[7]

The fourth level of identification that can be characterized is that of the nation or state. The fullness of this identification is achieved through citizenship. Until recent times, identification at this level was thought to be the broadest level institutionally organized.

Finally, a fifth level of identification is that of identification with the international or world community. In our times, institutional forms of global interrelationships do exist, including political, economic, educational, religious, military and recreational organizations; but the sum of these do not equal a unitary social structure.

An important aspect of coming to know oneself, of education, is developing conscious awareness of ones own identifications so much of which is reflexive, automatic and largely hidden from view. Ethnic identifications are particularly problematic in partially pluralistic United States of America where the aim of the schools for so long has been on "Americanizing" our population. For this reason, a large part of this paper will be taken up with the presentation of selected background materials whose salience may only be appreciated at the conclusion. This is all part of a

necessary undoing of what was done mistakenly. "Americanization" as a goal of education did not succeed. Unfortunately, it did not fail completely, so that today we are confronted with the reality that so large a portion of our population is not only not identifying with a global community, but also it is unable to identify with an ethnic community. It is hypothesised here that this in large part accounts for the racial and ethnic divisiveness found in the nation. For, as we shall see, the relationship of ethnic identity and self identity is close, and as the growth of one enhances the other, the atony of one diminishes the other. Put in its simplist form, one person cannot respect another if he does not respect himself.

II.

Erik W. Erikson's explanation of ego-identity is one among various theories that explain an individual's growth, development, and membership in a society. His notion of ego-identity is particularly relevant since it permits the construction of a conceptual framework that encompasses both continuities and discontinuities between the individual and societal ethos and these manifest any latent changes which occur in the social system in which he is a member. Erikson integrates the historical (biographical) social, cultural and constitutional data into a personality system. Furthermore, he converts developmental theory (Freudian or psychoanalytic) into interpersonal and social psychological language by means of his conception of the "Eight Aqes of Man": the eight states of emotional growth to maturity which result from the individual's interaction with his total social milieux.

Here, we are concerned with the "identity" stage. Erikson describes ego-identity as "the accrued confidence that one's ability to maintain inner sameness and continuity (one's ego in the psychological sense) is matched by the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for others."[8] For Erikson, ego-identity is dynamic, and it is developed and established through a series of new formations or successive differentiations called "identity-formation." According to Erikson, "identity formation" is

> ...<u>an evolving configuration</u> - a configuration which is gradually established by successive ego syntheses and re-syntheses throughout childhood. It is a configuration gradually integrating <u>constitutional givens, idio syncratic libidinial needs favored capacities, significant identifications, effective defenses, successful sublimations, and consistent roles</u>.[9]

Since "identity formation" is processual and developmental, ego-identity is that psychological structure which develops and manifests itself during an individual's life time. Thus, the term ego-identiy points

> ... to an individual's link with the unique values fostered by a unique history of his people. Yet it is also related to the cornerstone of this individual's unique development... It is this identity of something in the individual's core with an essential aspect of a group's inner coherence which is under consideration here: for the young, individual must learn to be most himself where he means most to others - those others, to be sure, who have come to mean most to him. The term identity expresses a neutral position in that it connotes both a persistent sameness within oneself (self-sameness) and a persistant sharing of some kind of essential character with others.
>
> ... At one time then, it will appear to refer to a conscious sense of <u>individual identity</u>, at another to an unconscious striving for a <u>continuity of personal character</u>; at a third as a criterion for the silent doings of ego-synthesis; and finally, as a maintainance of an inner solidarity with a group's ideals and identity.[10]

Erikson's discussion of both ego-formation and ego-identity attempts to bridge the psychological sociological sciences, and it is this bridge or interface that the interconnection between that which is social and that which is psychological is made.

Finally, Erikson views each developmental stage as a crisis that may be resolved in alternative ways. The reverse of ego-identity is not negative identity or no identity; rather, it is identity diffusion or role confusion. The opposite of <u>knowing</u> "who I am," is not merely <u>not knowing</u> "who I am" but also knowing <u>what to do</u>. The final resynthesis of these identity elements in late adolescence is fostered by a need and a press, to use

H. A. Murray's terms, i. e. the individual is driven from within to establish a sense of status beyond that which he inherits ascriptively (the need) and society pressures the individual to find an occupation and engage in worthwhile work (the press). He develops his psycho-social attitudes over time and space as he interacts with and internalizes those values promulgated by his societal millieux. The vague organizing, directing phenomena connecting the individual to his society in this new mature way (which also enhances his further growth) is called an ideology.

Ideology is another one of those truly elusive concepts in our language which avoids clear definition. Erikson borrows the term from Karl Mannheim, who explored and traced the history of its meanings from the 18th century to the 20th century. Derived from the Greek ἰδεῖν, to see, ideology refers to the traditional views that persons hold about reality, views that are shared by members of the group to which they belong and which guide them in their search for truth. Mannheim has shown the relationships between the traditional views which develop and the interpersonal activity which takes place over time. He described the nature of their relationship to social processes and history. The corpus of these views or ideas may be systematized, and since they may be related to εἶδος shape, through εἴδωλον "idols", that is, mental phantasies or even "preconceptions" attributable to society and tradition, they may be sources of error in the search for truth.[11] These views or ideologies about reality may be mythologic and/or fictitious, sometimes changing, sometimes immutable with the force of absolute. They function to promote the norms and values of the society, to present an underlying frame of reference for a coherent

perception of time - past, present and future - for the evaluation of beliefs, ideals and morality. Finally, ideological themes serve to integrate and stabilize the social order. No society is ever without its ideologies; similarly no person is ever fully socialized without internalizing them.

Through ideological polarization,[12] societies and individuals are able to pass their logic (or illogic) on from the present to the future, from one place to another. The importance of ideological polarization for committment to the group will be addressed later. But at this point it may be useful to review the ways in which ideologies, simplified and made clear by ideological polarization, seem to perform so importantly for individual growth. Erikson points out that ideologies offer youth:

> 1. a simplified perspective of the future which encompasses all foreseeable time and thus counteracts individual "time confusion";
> 2. some strongly felt correspondence between the inner world of ideals and evils and the social world with its goals and dangers;
> 3. an opportunity for exhibiting some uniformity of appearance and behavior counteracting individual identity-consciousness;
> 4. inducement to a collective experimentation with roles and techniques which help overcome a sense of inhibition and personal guilt;
> 5. introduction into the ethos of the prevailing technology and thus into sanctioned and regulated competition;
> 6. a geographical-historical world image as a framework for the young individual's budding identity;
> 7. a rationale for a sexual way of life compatible with a convincing system of principles; and
> 8. submission to leaders who are super human figures or "big brothers" are above the ambivalence of the parent-child relation.[13]

The socio-psycho interconnection of <u>identity and ideology</u> has so much impact and exists on so many levels, according to Erikson, that invariable one term always and automatically connotes the other.

In Chapter I of Young Man Luther, he writes:

> In this book, ideology will mean an unconscious tendency underlying religious and scientific as well as political thought: the tendency at a given time to make facts amenable to ideas, and ideas to facts, in order to create a world image convincing enough to support the collective and the individual sense of identity. Far from being arbitrary or consciously manageable (although it is as exploitable as all of man's unconscious strivings), the total perspective created by ideological simplification reveals its strength by the the dominance it exerts on the seeming logic of historical events, and by its influence on the identity formation of individuals (and thus on their ego-strength"). In this sense, this is a book on identity and ideology.[14]

Elsewhere Erikson writes about the process of identity formation: "... for we deal with a process "located" in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture, a process which establishes, in fact, the identity of these two identities."[15] And again, "... the social institution which is the guardian of identity is what we have called ideology."[16] In his book, Ghandi's Truth, Erikson attributes Ghandi's emergence as a great leader to Ghandi's personal experience and identification with his peoples "struggle for identity."[17] Ghandi's interests, and the interests of his people were one; their need patterns, in Murray's terms, were congealed and shared. This integral enmeshment of sociality and personality is asserted or referred to incessantly by both Mannheim and Erikson who approach the issue from opposite starting points. But the terms used in H. A. Murray's personological theories provide a method by which we can focus these broad generalizations on more specific individual-social phenomena, namely, that of persons in ethnic groups or more properly on the ethnicity of individuals.

Ethnicity following Milton M. Gordon and E. K. Francis, refers to those social, cultural, and psychological qualities and characteristics held in common by a group of individuals who participate in both a sense of "peoplehood" and a secondary communality based upon a shared ideology, which may be real or fictitious; "however vague and unreflective it may be."[18] Specifically, ethnicity may be based upon a common language or place of origin, a unique way of life or political organization, a set of religious doctrines or dogmas or a mythical common ancestry. In practice, the existence of ethnic groups continue even when the original basis for them disappears. This has been abundantly verified empirically, and presents no problem when one understands the meanings and inter-relationships of ideology and ego identity. But to develop an empirical methodology for analyzing ethnicity, a new concept is here proposed: "ethnic ideological themes." Ideological themes are formally defined as: the generalized leit-motifs and underlying principle features (of which an individual may or may not have awareness) of one's ideals, aspirations and interests, and the specific pattern of variation (i. e. rank ordering) of value orientations of individuals. When we refer to these topics and value orientations which are held in common by members of an ethnic group, we refer to them as ethnic ideological themes. Empirical evidence of the existence of ethnic ideological themes is now available.[19]

We pointed out earlier the persistence of ethnicity, despite the schools' attempt to eradicate it, has not yet been explained. The explanation, in part, can be attributed to ethnic ideological themes, "located" deep in the foundation of that dimension of individuals in our society where social and personality structures

constitute a unitary process. These themes are not easily eradicated - at least not without seriously weakening either or both the individual and the society. These ethnic ideological themes serve to preserve ethnicity in the United States, mainly because ethnicity, that sense of peoplehood and belongingness, operates to preserve the social, cultural and psychological integrity of a group for that group's survival in a "strange," foreign land.

In most instances ethnic ideological themes function to maintain a kind of group equilibrium. In those instances where they do not, there appears to be a "population threshold ration," a critical demographic point, below which immigrant communities fail to survive. In these cases, public ethnic institutions and social structures were never established so that children born to isolated families make, at best, only weak ethnic identifications. Over generations, the ethnic ideological themes may become exceedingly obscured if not dissembled. Even in such cases it is hypothesized that ethnic ideological themes do survive. This is due to their nature as ideologies which have been internalized even beyond levels of consciousness, and they are passed on through generations by the process of socialization and incorporation.

III.

The United States is a nation which received a good deal more from the immigrations during its history than just people. An "immigrant culture" evolved. What this means and how it happens is a theme we shall now develop by exploring the fascinating interconnections between ideas concerning immigration and ideas concerning intergroup interaction processes.

An important part of this exploration lies in the status and function multiplicities which certain salient ideas have. The melting pot assimilation theory, for example, is useful to illustrate briefly what this implies. In this country, the melting pot idea can be categorized in a number of ways. First, it represents beliefs, hopes, and aspirations. Additionally, it is a description and explanation of social events and processes which proceeded the immigrants "belongingness" in the United States of America. Finally, the melting pot notion may be seen as one of those fictional, mythical theoretical schema, whose function was to explain immigration to a new social milieu. The melting pot idea has not only become a collective ideology; it has developed into a kind of social theory and also, to use Mannheim's notion, as an "utopian wish image."[20] Will the melting pot materialize for the immigrant, becomes the question which we must seek to answer.

The very mention of the term "immigrants" evokes both ideologically colored images and images which have benerated feelings of estrangement and prejudice. Reasons for immigration were provided regarding the "types" of people who migrated. These judgements were apart from either empirical or historical reference. To suggest

that man migrates because he is by nature nomadic is but one answer to the question, "Why do people immigrate?" Similarly, to say that man is universally sedantary, which is implied in the overly simplified "push-pull models of migration, does not explain the differences in individual and group behavioral patterns. Some people migrate while others in similar situations do not. For our purposes, it is enough to say that men have migrated over long distances to better their life chances, and they settled in large numbers where their life chances were enhanced or where they were forced to stay.[21] The intermingling of cultural groups from Europe, Asia, and Africa were observed and extolled by Crevecoeur who wrote, "The Americans were once scattered all over Europe, here they are incorporated into one of the finest systems of population which has ever appeared, ...[22] Crevecoeur seems to have been one of the earliest, if not the first, writers to herald the melting pot idea.

> "... whence came all those people? They are a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch Germans and Swedes. From this promiscuous breed, that race now called Americans has risen.
>
> "...What then is the American, this new man? He is either an European, or the descendant of an European, hence that strange mixture of blood, which you will find in no other country. I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a French woman, and whose present four sons have now four wives of different nations. He is an American who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys and the new rank he holds. He becomes an American by being received in the broad lap of our great Alma Mater. Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labours and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world." [23]

Although he attempted to analyze the migration phenomenon qualitatively, the evidence, however, seems to indicate that this intermixing was not as general as Crevecoeur conjectured it to be. Abbott presents documents showing the failure of assimilation among the Germans, the Dutch, the Irish, the Scot, and the French during the years of 1789 to 1829.[24] Indeed, in reviewing the literature of that period, it is clear that English immigrants arrived in sufficient numbers and they exhibited such aggressiveness that their behavior patterns were imposed upon their co-settlers and the natives as well. By the close of the colonial period, White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestantism became the dominent theme. As the new century began, cities bulged with newcomers. The immigrants were different. They came not from Northern and Western Europe but from Southern and Eastern Europe. They were Italians, Greeks, Poles, Jews, Russians and Slavs; and each year they came in numbers large enough so that a good size city could be populated. The distinctive institutions and social organization which developed in the United States, reflecting the goals of a democracy and free enterprise, seemed threatened by these immigrated ethnics.

In 1909, Israel Zangwill's play, The Melting Pot, was produced.[25] It was through drama that Zangwill attempted to explain the common phenomenon of mass immigration. The play projected a new image of the teeming-with-immigrants city. The city, for Zangwill, was fast becoming a seething cauldron into which the nations and mankind were poured, uniformally mixed. From this cauldron, supposedly evolved the new unified super-being, the "United States of America." The Melting Pot theme thus became, for a while, a popular symbol for the socio-cultural and socio-political homogeneity of all that is American.

The melting pot ideas of Creveceour and Zangwill predicted change in the immigrants' ideological themes and change in the host society's themes as well. Further, they predicted total assimilation. There are some differences, however, that should be noted. First, the "ingredients" that went into Creveceour's pot were (noting here the early status of Africans and Indians) homogeneous in race, and religion, and the majority were of the same national origin. Zangwill's pot, on the other hand, contained far more heterogeneity in race, national origin and religion.

Another salient difference between Creveceour and Zangwill relates to the immigrants' response to the social and cultural conditions of their host society. Creveceour's immigrants regarded the Indian tribes and nations as savages to be Christianized. When the Indians resisted encroachment of their lands, they were callously ejected, destroyed. Zangwill's migrants sought to become a vital, working part in the new culture they encountered. Finally, the product which emerged from the melting pot of Creveceour was the rural, Protestant, Anglo-American. But what will emerge from the pot of Zangwill? Certainly, if we use his analogy, we can expect that a new "United States of America," not an Anglo-American will emerge. And this new being's destiny will be harnessed to an urban, not a rural way of life.

Upon reviewing recent studies[26] of these immigrant groups we find that they have not "melted", as Creveceour and Zangwill had attempted to note. These Germans, Italians, Irish, Jews, Poles Africans, Japanese and others have in so many ways not become Anglo-Americans, and indeed, they seem not to want to be Anglo-Americans. They want to be German-Americans, Italian-Americans

Irish-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Polish-Americans, African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and so on. In view of this, we must move along two avenues of inquiry. First, how is the hyphenated form of group adjustment and assimilation to be explained. Secondly, what does this signify about the "United States of America?"

Briefly, the history of theories explaining assimilation in the United States follows closely the history of ideologies about immigration. Initially, it was thought that all immigrants would, after two, three or at most four generations, become Anglo-Americans or conform as closely as possible to this model. When it became apparent that not all immigrants were conforming (the Irish and Germans were especially noticeable,) the melting pot idea popularized by Zangwill, served the purpose for some to explain this phenomenon. Through education in the public schools, through the teaching of the English language and United States civics and history, the foreigner would be Americanized. The restrictionists, native "Americans" like Henry Pratt Fairchild, who did not believe Americanization could work, ridiculed the effort. He called upon immigrants individually to renounce their foreigness explaining that only by disassociating oneself from their foreign culture, could one acquire the true "American" sentiments.[27]

Even after passage of the Quota Acts, new, small immigrant countries mushroomed in urban areas. Migrations from rural areas to cities continued rather rapidly. In the next decade or so, the rural-urban trek was made by ever increasing number of persons. From the south, both whites and blacks moved into northern and western cities and established colonies. Mexicans and Canadians, not restricted by law, also immigrated to the United States. Even casual

observers of cities recognized that neither the "Anglo-conformity," "melting pot," nor the "Americanization" concepts explained the characteristics of the immigrant populatins nor the processes that produced them. Real cities in this country were not monocultural fields. On the contrary, they reflected a type of "nation of nations," a direction in which the United States was moving. Cultural pluralism, a concept first introduced by Horace Kallen in 1915[28] was revived in the late 30's and early 40's, both as an ideology and as an explanation of the observed behavior. Briefly, this notion implies that each ethnic group can, should and does maintain itself as a "community" with its distinctive culture, even while its members become citizens and participate in the politics and economy of the broader society. Gordon, however, suggests that there is still another term which may be more appropriate to explain and describe this phenomenon: namely, structural pluralism.[29]

A clear example of non-assimilation in this society is the adherence to various religious institutions found here. From the cultural pluralism point of view, democracy guarantees the right of these groups to remain structurally separate, and it prohibits discrimination based on religious affiliation. Furthermore, the fact that ethnic groups in the cities of the United States have shown some degree of assimilation is obvious, but they have not become totally enmeshed in the American milieu. They, as groups, have learned to communicate in English, become citizens, acquired the Anglo ideological themes in terms of upward mobility, and so on. In a word, they became, in time, "Anglo-Americanized."

The Amglo-American cultural system, that is, the ideological themes promulgated by the English, manifested themselves by virtue

of their predominance when the nation was founded; hence Anglo-Americans remain the core culture in American society. White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant represent the model to which all other groups must necessarily conform or aspire. Furthermore, this group has been the most successful, ingrained United States of American group whom other ethnics must to some degree emulate to survive and succeed, even on a marginal level. What this means is that "WASP Americans" are entering, consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, into accomodation patterns with other ethnics particularly in the cities. Thus, structural pluralism is for Gordon, a salient feature which manifests itself in the United States of American culture. Assimilation must now be seen as having two directions - one which leans toward the core or dominant culture and then returns to ethnic originality namely those ideological themes which existed prior to the immigrants coming to this country. In this sense, the United States of American culture may be described as a fluctuous, "emerging culture", capable of changing with the arrival of large numbers of persons.

Perhaps the most important of recent notions regarding group adjustment and assimilation is "impact-integration." This notion is best examined by analyzing its constituent terms, in reverse order. The meaning of "integration", which, of course connotes much in ordinary usage, is best understood as coming from mathematics to be utilized as a more neutral replacement for concepts like assimilation and acculturation. Glazer, who apparently was the first to adopt these perameters, asserts that immigrants are integrated with Americans when: 1) they are no longer a special

social problem, 2) their old nation political interests become subordinate to United States interests, and 3) when, in the United States of American culture which they have changed, they as well as old United States of Americans, are at home.[30] Bernard too used the term "integrated" noting that our "immigrant stock and our so called 'native' stock have each integrated with the other." Bernard explains this by pointing out how each element is changed by association with the other, yet does not lose its own cultural identity. Bernard concludes by saying: "Without becoming metaphysical, let us say that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and the parts, whole affected by interaction with each other, nevertheless, remain complementary but individual."[31] We may conclude, then, following Glazer and Bernard, that "integration" is a part of the general tradition of cultural pluralism; more specifically integration helps define a condition and dimension of <u>emerging</u> culture.

Continuing, we note that "impact", the first unit of the important notion of impact-integration denotes certain cultural factors of ethnic groups coming together. At first we see that the term has a somewhat negative connotation because it suggests a resounding meeting or intersection, bodies forcibly conjoining, with resultant noise, alarm, and confusing entanglement. However, one must recognize complex forces of this collision and come to appreciate the creative aftermath of the dynamics of the process. We might begin by looking at the two, at first primarily opposed sides, the dominant ethnic group of a society and the immigrants. The dominant group has several reactions. It often

reacts with "territoriality" because it sees the immigrants as invading strangers. The dominant group views the cultural patterns of the immigrants as different, inferior, threatening. The dominant group counters with psychic distantiation and territorial defensiveness. This may lead to overt patterns of emphasizing its own priority, superiority, and appropriateness to the country. Thus, the dominant group may deprecate the newcomers and attempt to frustrate their attempts, seeking to cast the immigrants into the role of "estranged intruder." The immigrants meanwhile are expected to pay a price for admission; they can legitimize their presence by social and psychological subordination and submission. However, they often refuse to do this. They have been toughened and deepened by their sufferings, their courage, their decisions associated with the very act of immigration. They have come too far to surrender so easily, certainly not willingly. No ethnic group has ever completely submitted; this is conformed by the empirical evidence.[32]

But the result of this process is not a dark and grim affair; the struggle is heated but not hopeless and meaningless. One may take an optimistic view, for out of this <u>impacting</u> comes the new synthesis for an emerging culture. Race and ethnic conflicts have been and are still a very real and important part of our history; that new syntheses evolve out of this impacting and integration gives greater meaning and insight into our future development, for the conflict is resolved in a cultural integration that changes the whole society itself, not just the parts, the persons and groups involved. "The effect of the collision and conflict ensuing from migratory movements which has been most attentively considered is the change in established institutions and social organization."[33]

Impacting also changes the people in the society; the immigrants are changed most of all, but so are the earlier residents. Sociologists have provided us with general descriptions about these changes in the newcomers. Social scientists have described the confusion, the alienation and the fears that the immigrant experiences when first settling, and the comfort and security he derived from moving into close physical proximity to friends and relatives. These are the immigrant communities.

Second generation ethnics, the United States born children of immigrants, ashamed of the foreign behavior of their parents, often rejected their ancestry; others, as a defense against the overt cruel acts of prejudice directed toward them, over-identified with the old culture of their parents. Many of the second generation also felt the pain of marginality, not knowing whether they were United States of Americans or foreigners. In the third generation and beyond, the immigrants offspring began to feel more secure in their United States of Americaness. As they become young adults, they are able in assessing their own resources, to ask about their distinctive backgrounds and develop new interest in their ancestral heritage. The process of coming to feel at home in the United States of America, has, for most ethnic groups, been a work of generations. Fundamental reorientations, in part as a result of imposed behavior patterns, have been made in their ideological systems and consequently in their ego identities. These changes are facilitated by the simultaneous changes occuring in the core culture as well. Earlier residents, expanding the boundaries of United States American culture and society, accept the new cultural realities; and as a result of the confrontation, they too have

experienced ideological reorientation. Many second, third and fourth generation progeny of immigrants have found that they are now able to establish a link with the earlier residents and with the United States American heritage and together they achieve an impacted unity in a new developing United States cultural milieux, namely that of a constantly refreshened immigrant culture.

IV.

The foregoing discussion shows the connection between the idea of individual development (that is, the emergence of a person as a self-reliant, independent being) and the various meanings of ideology. Ideology is related to how personality grows and it is related to how Americans think about immigrants. The inter-relatedness of these notions was presented in order to explain some social psychological aspects of the process by which we Americans become Americans. It has been suggested that in the formation of ego-identity we acquire ethnic ideological themes which we reshape as we live and transmit to our children. This explanation becomes more comprehensive as we explore the relationship between ego-identity and citizenship since the single, most unique quality of United States Americans[34] is their citizenship in the United States of America.

The idea of citizenship is an ancient one of course, having its origin in Greece and Rome. The very word citizen derives from the latin civitas meaning city. A citizen is an inhabitant of a the city and over time this has come to mean not just the inhabitant of a place but more importantly one who has civic rights and duties there. Historically, the term citizen was a radical term and its revolutionary content is particularly to be noted in this bicentennial year. Citizens, in contradistinction to subjects, are persons who participate in their own rule. In ancient time, Herodutus taunted the Persian soldiers by pointing out that they were subjects to their king whereas the Greeks were citizens, meaning that they were more than merely free, they governed themselves. Citizen, therefore, is more properly used to refer to members of democratic

rather than despotic governments and herein lies its truly revolutionary meaning.

This theme of a difference between subject and citizen as a characteristic of democratic governments is reflected time and again in the writings of the ancients, and can be found in the works of Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle, in Aurelius, Virgil, Plutarch, and later in Acquinas, Dante, Hobbes, Montaigne, and J. S. Mill, and in the United States, in the Federalist writers.

In the French Revolution citizen was a revolutionary term, and the founding fathers of our nation also used the term.

Aside from the difference between subject and citizen, it is important to make a distinction between "a population" and "the people." The people are only those who may take an active political part in the life of the country. Foreigners, aliens, visitors and slaves, for example, are part of the population but they were not considered citizens or part of "the people." Their rights and duties were highly circumscribed.

There is an important similarity between the ancient states (Greece and Rome) and the United States with regard to two connotations of the word "people." First, people means citizens, and second, people refers to a feeling of being intimately united. Underlying these societies, there were certain recognizable pervasive principles which we earlier called <u>themes</u>.

In the United States, one salient theme underlying the office of citizen is the acceptance of United States political doctrines as they are embodied in constitutional democracy. This is what we refer to as United States <u>ideology</u>.

The specific influence that this ideology has on our behavior

generates behavioral modes, attitudes, "ways of life", etc. that mark us off, and set us apart from others, and foster in us feelings of sameness and oneness with each other - the sense of peoplehood which we earlier referred to as ethnic. Belief in and acceptance of constitutional democracy in and of itself does not distinguish United States Americans from all others, but the distinctive history of the nation and the unique biographies of those who identify with it does. It is for this reason that United States Americans of different ethnic backgrounds are so easily and quickly identified as United States Americans when they visit foreign lands. To put this in another way, the ethnic aspect of social heritage has at least two major dimensions; one is the "foreign" heritage which we inherit from our forebears who came or joined the United States; and the second is the developing heritage of a person integrated into this society. These two aspects constitute the ethnicity of the so called hyphenated United States American. All United States Americans are by this definition hyphenated and ethnic.

In ancient Rome and Greece, what entitled a person to become a citizen was his basic acceptance of and ability to defend the gods of his city. This underlying basic tenet constituted the essential ideology and is mentioned here for the light it sheds on our own social structure. The inseparability of religion and polities in the ancient societies derives, at least in part, from the simpler organizational structure of those societies. The committment to constitutional democracy in the United States whose society is characterized by a vastly more comples system of both vertical and hierarchial differentiation, is nevertheless similar in that it is

given with almost sacred allegiance.

In Rome and Greece this primary sense of peoplehood did not require a homegeneity of cultural forms. That is to say, not only individuals but even groups of people of different birth, of different life styles living in different geographical areas, having different belief systems, norms and folkways could all be citizens of Rome or Greece. Indeed their heterogeneity is reflected in the terms "omnes gentes" and τὰ ἔθνη, terms used to describe certain citizens there. Our own word "ethnic" derives from this word ἔθνη, meaning people.

In the United States those who are citizens are referred to in the Constitution as "We the people of the United States." It is interesting that the term citizen is not defined in the Constitution, nor is the office of citizen defined in our laws. Of course, the 14th Admendment defines who are citizens, but it is not our purpose to analyze or explore the legal aspects of this concept here, except to point out some salient facets of citizenship which will highlight its relationship to ethnic heritage.

Earlier we introduced the proposition that members of the core dominant group, acting territorially toward newcomers, transform them into "estranged intruders." Citizens of a constitutional democracy, being, in a certain sense the state itself, transform the newcomer into an "alien" (That is an "other" from the latin alius.) But neither should these terms nor should the histories they imply be confused. Aliens do not necessarily have to be estranged intruders, and citizens, even those who recently immigrated, must not be estranged intruders. To take the office of citizen and to fulfill the roles of citizenship does not require any more homogenization of cultural

forms in the United States than it did in the ancient societies. Citizenship among the ancients was a moral enterprise, based, as we have said, upon dedication to and defense of the gods. Accepting municipal burdens (munera), participating in government, and sharing in the honors of the state are the gifts and duties of citizens.[35] What was required than and is required now is a moral committment to an essential ideology. Historians and political philosophers have explained man's penchant for government and civil society in terms of various social contact theories; and the degree of influence this explanation has had upon the founding fathers of our nation is well documented. No matter how the founding of society is viewed, whether as a rational response to the vicissitudes of nature (including other men) or as an evolution out of extended familial and religious ties, this type of explanation tends to emphasize the external pressures (the press) upon man to organize. What we see now in the light of our propositions about ethnic ego-identity is that the office and role of citizen also satisfies an inner psychological pressure, a need.

As young people achieve their majority in late adolescence, the process of identity formation of which we spoke earlier goes on. Society through its parents, its teachers, its other adults, through graduations and other processes, through its ideologies, confirms young people, and young people through their clubs and gangs and cliques and associations affirm each other. This confirmation and affirmation provide the basis for self-esteem and a sense of achievement. Young people develop what E. H. Erikson calls an inner need to be true to each other, and this expresses itself in a heightened

sense of duty and in loyalty.[36] Three of what Erikson calls "basic virtues" (i.e. virtues that re-emerge from generation to generation) begin to develop at this time.[37] With the formation of Identity there develops Fidelity - the need, the strength and the ability to devote oneself to one's society, past and future, in one's own special way. With the stage of Intimacy there develops Love - the capacity for affiliation and the ethical strength to abide by committments, even in the face of harsh sacrifices. Finally, with Generativity there develops Care - concern for the continuance of oneself and the race through one's progeny, one's work and one's ideas.

When responsible citizenship,[38] and the moral committment, patriotism and concern it implies, is entered into, inner needs and external press are integrated. The immigrants become naturalized and their children are born nationals. As generations pass, the conscious rememberances of other worlds dim, but the ethnic ideological themes persist giving continuity to lives by bridging former societies and new ones.

Among the elements of citizenship that T. H. Marshal[39] distinguishes is the social element which includes the right of all citizens "to share to the full in the social heritage ... /~ of_7 the society." He adds that "The institutions most closely connected with it /~ social element_7 are the educational system and the social services." From this point of view all U. S. Americans have the right to expect the educational system to include ethnic heritage studes in the curricula and to foster it in extra-curricula ways. The perspective we have developed here focuses on both education for ethnic heritage and education for citizenship as isotopic species of moral education.

Footnotes

1. Michael Parenti, "Ethnic Politics and Persistence of Ethnic Identification", The American Political Science Review, Vol. LXI, No. 3, September, 1967, pp. 717-726. For a more recent statement, see: Charles H. Mindel and Robert W. Habenstein, Ethnic Families in America, New York, Elsevier, 1976.

2. Erik H. Erikson, Childhood and Society, 2nd ed., New York, Norton Co., 1963. passin.

3. Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils) New York, Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1936, pp. 55-108.

4. Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938, p. 123.

5. Francis X. Femminella, Ethnicity and Ego-Identity, Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1968, (69-3169 University Microfilm, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

6. Francis X. Femminella, "The Impact of Italian Migration and American Catholicism", The American Catholic Sociological Review, Fall, 1961, Vol. XXII, No. 3, pp. 233-241. cf. also Nicholas J.Russo, "Three Generations of Italians in New York: Their Religious Acculturation," The International Migration Review, Vol. III, No. 2, Spring, 1969, pp. 3-18. For a different view, see Hart M. Nelsen and H. David Allen, "Ethnicity, Americanization, and Religious Attendance", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 79, No. 4, (January, 1974) pp. 906-922.

7. E. K. Francis, "The Nature of the Ethnic Group", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 52, No. 5 (March, 1974) pp. 393-400.

8. Erik H. Erikson, "Growth and Crises of the Healthy Personality" in George S. Klein (Ed.), Psychological Issues, New York International Universities Press, Inc., 1959, p. 89.

9. Ibid., p. 116.

10. Ibid., p. 102.

11. Mannheim, op. cit., p. 61-62.

12. "Ideological polarization" is a process of breaking the multiplicity of values, ideas, images, ideals, beliefs, religions, political and even scientific creeds down into simplified coherent overall orientations. Erikson, Psychological Issues, New York International Universities Press, Inc., p. 156.

13. Erik H. Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis, New York W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1968, pp. 187-188.

14. Erik H. Erikson, Young Man Luther, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1958, pp, 22,

15. Identity, Youth & Crisis, p. 22.

16. Ibid., p. 133.

17. Ghandi's Truth, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1969, p.266.

18. E. K. Francis, op. cit., p. 399, Cf. Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964.

19. Francis X. Femminella,"Ethnicity and Ego Identity", op. cit., pp. 75-89.

20. Op. Cit., pp. 192-193. In this section I have borrowed extensively from earlier works especially "The Immigrant and the Melting Pot, in M. I. Urofsky, Perspectives on Urban America, New York, Doubleday, 1973.

21. See for example, Frederick J. Teggart, Theory and Processes of History, Berkley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1962 (originally published as two books by Yale University Press, 1918 and 1925) pp. 253 ff and also pp. 180 ff.

22. J. Hector St. John De Crevecoeur, "What is an American?" (excerpts from Letters of An American Farmer, published in London 1782), reprinted in Edith Abbott, Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem, Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago Press, 1926, p. 418.

23. Idem. Italics in the last sentence are mine.

24. Abbott, op. cit., Documents 3, 4, 5 and 6, pp. 422-436. See also Charles H. Anderson, White, Protestant Americans, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice Hall, Inc. 1970.

25. Israel Zangwill, The Melting Pot, New York, Macmillan & Co., 1909.

26. Mindel and Habenstein, op. cit. See also recent issues of the International Migration Review.

27. Henry Pratt Fairchild, The Melting Pot Mistake, Boston, Mass., Little, Brown & Co., 1926, p. 203.

28. Gordon's treatment of this notion is the basis for this section. op. cit., pp. 132 ff.

29. Gordon, op. cit., especially Chapters 4, 5 and 6, pp. 84 ffl. Cf. Oscar Handlin, The American People in the Twentieth Century, Boston, Mass., Beacon Press, 1963. originally published by Harvard University Press, 1954.

30. Nathan Glazer, "The Integration of American Immigrants," Law and Contemporary Problems, Duke University School of Law, 1956, p. 256-269.

31. William S. Bernard, "The Integration of Immigrants in the United States", UNESCO (mimeo) 1956, p. 2, as quoted in Gordon, op. cit., p. 68.

32. Anderson, op. cit., p. XIV. See what Anderson says about the Danes, "...one of the most assimilable peoples to come to this country." pp. 69-71.

33. F. J. Teggart, op. cit., p. 196. My use of the terms "collision" and "conflict" were completely independent of Teggart's earlier use.

34. Citizens of the United States of America have, since before the founding of the nation, referred to themselves as "Americans" and used the term "American" to refer exclusively to them. This usage is now considered by many to be a usurpation; and by its continued used in this manner, it offends those who are not citizens of the United States but of other North and South American nations. In the remainder of this paper, therefore, the term "American" will be replaced with the term "United States Americans."

35. The Latin language describes this in an interesting way. Municipal comes through municipalis from municeps meaning citizen of a free city. Muni means duties and cep is from capere, to take. A citizen takes duties. A similar root is munus - a gift, from which comes our word, munificent. A citizen takes gifts. See also, A. N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, 2nd ed. London, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1973, esp. pp. 437-444. Alexander P. Morse, A Treatise on Citizenship, Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1881, p. 23. Frederick A. G. Beck, Greek Education, London, Meuthen & Co., Ltd., 1964, esp. pp. 304 ff.

36. Erik H. Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity" in E. H. Erikson (ed.) Youth: Change and Challange, New York Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1963, pp. 1-23.

37. E. H. Erikson, Childhood and Society, op. cit., p. 274.

38. See Robert E. Cleary, Political Education in the American Democracy, Scranton, Pa., International Educational Publishers, 1971, esp. Chap. 3. For a fuller discussion of committment and especially "civil committment" see Solon T. Kimbal and James E. McClellan, Jr., Education and the New America, N. Y. Random House, 1962, esp. 249 ff.

39. T. H. Marshall, Class, Citizenship and Social Development, N. Y. Doubleday Anchor Books, 1965, p. 78.